

### **REMARKS**

Claims 8-21 are pending in the present application. Claims 8 and 16 are independent claims. Claim 16 has been amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections in view of the following Remarks.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has allowed claims 8-15.

#### ***Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 16, 17, 19, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,963,012 to Garcia et al. (hereafter "Garcia") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,734,254 to Stephens (hereafter "Stephens") and the article "Prius in the Wild" by Remy Chevalier (hereafter "Chevalier").

Claim 18 further stands rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia, Stephens, and Chevalier, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,275,143 to Stobbe (hereafter "Stobbe"). Claim 19 further stands rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia, Stephens, and Chevalier in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,455,466 to Parks et al. (hereafter "Parks"). Claim 20 further stands rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia, Stephens, and Chevalier in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,163,132 to Higuchi et al. (hereafter "Higuchi").

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to MPEP § 2143.03, which sets forth the following requirements for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103:

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art fails to provide a teaching or suggestion of all of the features in the claimed invention.

For instance, amended claim 16 recites, “displaying an object...to visually indicate that external power is being received, wherein the displayed object visually differentiates between receiving external inductive power and external utility power.” The Examiner acknowledges that neither Garcia nor Stephens teaches or suggests such an element. However, the Examiner asserts that Chevalier teaches this claim element. Applicants respectfully disagree.

At most, Chevalier teaches a computer screen in the dashboard of a hybrid car, which notifies the driver when the gasoline engine is charging the battery (top fig.), when electric motor is working alone to drive the car (middle fig.), and when the gasoline engine kicks in during driving. However, neither the gasoline engine, electric motor, nor battery can reasonably be interpreted as supplying *external* power -- they are inside the car. Thus, Chevalier’s computer screen does not *visually indicate that external power is being received*, as claimed. Further, none of the gasoline engine, electric motor, and battery in Chevalier could reasonably be interpreted as supplying *utility power*, according to the art recognized meaning of that term. Thus, even though Chevalier’s computer screen differentiates between the gasoline engine, electric motor, and battery, this neither teaches nor suggests visually differentiating between receiving inductive power and utility power.

Thus, Chevalier does not teach or suggest displaying an object that visually indicates that external power is being received, and visually differentiates between receiving external inductive power and external utility power, as required by independent claim 16. Further, as acknowledged by the Examiner, neither Garcia nor Stephens remedies this deficiency. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 16 is allowable, and claims 17, 19, and 21 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 16.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that none of Stobbe, Parks, and Higuchi remedy the aforementioned deficiency of Garcia, Stephens, and Chevalier. Particularly, Stobbe is relied on

by the Examiner only to teach transmitting authenticating data to a source (Office Action at page 4). Parks is relied on only to teach converting inductive power to a direct current responsive to the receiving step (Office Action at page 4). Further, Higuchi is relied on only to teach transmitting data indicative of the step of receiving inductive power (Office Action at page 5). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18-20 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 16.

### *Conclusion*

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied on by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

Should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of the undersigned to discuss the present application in an effort to expedite prosecution.

Application No. 10/733,850  
Amendment filed October 31, 2007  
After Final Office Action of July 12, 2007

Docket No.: 5486-0143PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By

*for*

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant